

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/586,351 | Applicant(s) TANAKA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Kajli Prince | Art Unit 2874 | |

All Participants:

(1) Kajli Prince.

(2) David Minken.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 July 2007

Time: 9:15 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

Claim 18

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I expressed to Mr. Minken that claim 18 was written improperly. As written, claim 18 appeared to be an apparatus claim depending from a method claim (claim 11). However, on 18 July 2007 I confirmed with Mr. William Berridge that claim would be re-written as a method claim depending from claim 11..